# RESULTS OF ANNUAL PERSONNEL SURVEY
## COMPLETED IN 2002 FOR FY 00-01

The Consulting Services Unit in the Division of Human Resources  (DHR) of the Department of Personnel and Administration conducts the Annual Personnel Survey.  The information collected is self-reported and represents general HR activity performed by departments for Fiscal Year 2000-2001.  DHR is required to collect this data for reporting purposes, and the data requested as part of the survey cannot be captured electronically.  This information is used by the legislature, other units within DHR, and other states' personnel departments.

A request was sent to department human resource administrators on November 1, 2001, with a due date of November 30, 2001.  The data was conducted primarily on-line and by e-mail.  On December 5, 2001, and again on January 7, 2002, follow-up contact was made with those departments that had not responded.  Fifty out of 53 departments provided information for this summary report.

**CORE HUMAN RESOURCE FUNCTIONS - PERSONNEL STAFF SUMMARY**

The personnel staff summary is intended to show the ratio of professional and technical HR staff to employees.  In reviewing the data, some factors may affect the reported ratio.  These factors do not appear to be substantial because the ratios remain consistent with last year's figures.  In the FY 99-00 report, it was unclear as to whether departments reported non-classified human resource (HR) professional positions or positions located outside of the HR office.  This year the survey asked departments to include these positions into the overall FTE count.  It appears that most of this information was reported correctly, but continued efforts will be made to improve the accuracy of this data.   Also, some departments (CCCS, AHEC, and DPA) perform human resource activities (e.g., selection and job evaluation) for other departments.  This might skew the overall ratio as well as the individual department ratio.

Total number of FTE performing HR functions statewide was 379.68.  Total number of employees in the state personnel system was 34,153.  The ratio of total HR FTE to 100 state employees was 1.11 FTE.

The total HR professional (classified and non-classified) FTE was 220.18 for a ratio of .64 FTE to every 100 state employees.  Non-classified professional positions account for approximately 11% of the overall FTE level.  Professional duties involve individual position allocation, exam administration, employee relations, benefit administration, and training.  Personnel administrators are counted as part of this FTE.

The total HR support FTE was 159.5 for a ratio of .47 FTE to every 100 state employees.  Included were Program Assistants, Data Specialists, Administrative Assistants, Office Managers, and Accounting Technicians who perform such duties as exam monitoring, leave and time keeping, and entry into EMPL or CPPS or ADS.

The ratios for FY 99-00, were .53 FTE and .40 FTE respectively.  The .53 FTE did not include non-classified professionals.

## SECTION I - JOB EVALUATION ACTIONS

Thirty-four departments responded with information on their *job evaluation* actions. These totals exclude actions performed by DHR for centralized agencies.

1. Total number of job evaluation actions completed = 5239. This is nearly half of what was completed and reported in FY 99-00 (11,741).

2. The average turn-around time to complete an official allocation request = 20.79 days.

3. Total number of job evaluations for <u>filled</u> positions = 2232, 42.6% of the job evaluation actions.

   a. Of the evaluations of filled positions, 87 (3.9%) were sustained.

   b. Of the evaluations of filled positions, 2097 (40%) were allocated upward.

   c. Of the evaluations of filled positions, 48 (2.1%) were allocated downward. Fifteen were from one department.

4. Total number of *FLSA* complaints filed with the U.S. Dept. of Labor = 0.

   a. Forty-five of the 50 departments responding to the survey have made FLSA exemption status designations on all positions in the state personnel system. Three departments are in the process of making the designations.
   b. Ten departments do not have compensatory time agreements with their non-exempt employees.
   c. Three departments reported that they do not have detailed records on non-exempt employees (e.g., work hours, work week, compensatory time earned and paid), one reporting department did not respond to the question.


## SECTION II – SELECTION

Thirty-eight departments responded to questions 1 and 2 of the survey. Most departments indicated that they were unable to track filling a vacancy from *termination* to referral. The information below is from when the HR office *received a request to fill* a position to referral. There was not enough data on the turnaround time for frequently filled positions to be shared in this report.

1. The number of new hires into the state personnel system = 3805. This represents 12% of the reporting departments' population.

2. Turnaround time for an announced vacancy from request to referral = 44.42 days.

3. Turnaround time from referral to appointment = 18.77 days.

4. Thirty-one departments reported specific information on their five most difficult to fill classes. The difficult to fill classes span eight of the 10 occupational groups.

| Occupation Or Class | Avg. days to hire after selection process begins | % hired from state departments (e.g., transfer, promotion) | Why do you think you are having hiring difficulty in these classes? |
|---|---|---|---|
| Patrol Intern | 60 | 0% | Small applicant pool, competing with local law enforcement, salary, shifts. |
| Spec Ed Tech IV, Psych Care Aide & Tech I, Nurse I, Early Childhood Educators, Mental Health Clinicians, Social Workers, Psychologists | 60 to 120 | 0% | National nursing shortage, non-competitive salaries, special qualifications, geographical locations. |
| Licensed Electricians and Plumbers, Equipment Operator, Custodian I & II, Dining Services I, Security I | 20 to 90 | 0% | Low starting salaries, shift work required, applicant availability, turnover, nature or work, labor market, background checks, benefit costs. |
| Dispatchers, Admin Assistants, Library Technicians, Collections Reps | 20 to 60 | 5% to 50% | Job market demand, low salary, good economy, lack of computer skills, high transfer rate, shift work (part time and weekends), benefit costs, location, work environment. |
| Dentists and Physicians | 180 | 0% | Salary, location, work environment. |
| IT Professional, IT Technicians, Program Assistants, General Professional (specific work experience) | 15 to 180 | 1% to 30% | Low salary, competitive pay outside of state, expertise, specialized area/fewer skilled workers, location. |
| Engineers, Laboratory Coordinators | 60 to 120 | 0% | Special qualifications, lack of qualified applicants, low salary, unique fields or specialty areas. |

Nineteen responses were reported for positions that were difficult to fill in the Labor, Trades, and Crafts occupational group. Of those, 52% (10) were for Custodian positions. IT positions are still difficult to fill, but the demand for the technician level positions appeared to be greater than the professional level.

Competitive salary and availability of qualified applicants were the most common reasons given for hiring difficulty; and, for obvious reasons, benefit cost was much more prevalent in FY 00-01 than 99-00.

5. Four departments do not use ADS to track the number of applicants.

6. The top 10 reasons that respondents reported on *why employees are attracted* to their departments and state government.
- Employment security/stability (26).
- Benefits (16).
- Competitive salaries (8, responses mainly from departments outside of the Front Range).

- Retirement package (10).
- Interest in working for higher education (7).
- Location (6).
- Commitment to degree (8).
- Tuition (3).
- Leave (2).

These reasons remain consistent with last year's report. Other reasons mentioned include: good work hours, flexibility, interesting programs, mobility among departments, stimulating working conditions/environment, good community image, cultural advantages, serving the public, individual agency mission/core values.

7. *Recruitment* tools used by most departments include the following.
- The state website (25).
- Newspaper advertising (local and regional) (28).
- Transfers (3).
- Word of mouth (9).
- Job fairs (11).

Additional tools include job service centers, college recruitment offices, intern programs, professional organizations, special interest groups, target mailings, other websites, community outreach programs, and use of referral awards.

8. Suggestions on what *recruitment* tools DHR can provide are as follows.
- Competitive, affordable benefits (10).
- Provide leadership in constitutional change, e.g., changing the 'rule of three' (4).
- Streamline testing requirements (2).
- Broader pay ranges (1).
- Develop a statewide recruiter function that would coordinate advertising within the *Denver Post* and *Rocky Mountain News* and market positions as one employer (3).

9. *Retention* tools used by departments include training and professional development, tuition reimbursement, discretionary pay and incentive awards, flexible work hours, and recognition programs.

10. Suggestions for what *retention* tools the DHR can provide include the following.
- Additional non-monetary retention ideas (8).
- Cost effective training and career development opportunities (4).
- Improved benefit programs and increased state contribution (12).
- Broadbanding of job classes (2).
- Better succession planning packages and tools (2).

11. Although the most common reason given for leaving a job is pay, other reasons include frustration with bureaucracy, lack of promotional opportunities, poor supervision, changing family situations, retirement, and benefit costs.

12. Twenty-seven of the departments conduct exit interviews. The information is used for trend analysis and succession planning, improving job descriptions and making changes in recruitment

practices, conducting interviews, improving communication efforts, modifying the work environment, identifying training needs, monitoring supervision issues, and improving customer service.

## SECTION III:  WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT

1.  Forty-five departments provide *training* programs for their employees.  Two departments reported no training programs.  The departments providing training do so to maintain licensure or certification, keep employees aware and informed, and help employees succeed in their jobs.  The most common training topics include the following.  These remain consistent with the FY 99-00 report.

- Computer training, e.g., PC and mainframe software, related skills, website, Excel, Word, Access, applications, technology.
- Supervisory skills and management, including conflict management, leadership, discipline.
- Performance management and performance pay.
- Customer service.
- Sexual harassment.
- Workplace violence.
- Leave – FMLA.
- New employee orientation.
- Diversity.
- Stress management.

2.  Ten departments reported having some form of *succession (replacement) planning* for employees who may be retiring.  Forty departments reported having no succession planning function in place. Plans range from informal meetings with managers and supervisors to cross-training and mentoring programs to a couple of departments who have an established program in place.  Last year 18 departments indicated having succession planning functions, it is unclear as to the discrepancy.

3.  Thirteen reported that they provide *career development* counseling for their employees.  Thirty-six departments do not provide *career development* at all.  Of those that do provide this service, it is handled in the following ways.

- During performance planning/evaluation meetings with managers or supervisors.
- The human resource office sometimes acts in this capacity.
- Only on an "as needed" basis, by employee request, or one-on-one counseling.
- Transportation provides career counseling through an arrangement with community colleges throughout the state.  The department pays for the first three hours of assessment and counseling for certified employees.
- One agency used an ad hoc report.
- Available through the career office on campus that provides service to students and employees.
- Employees are encouraged to take advantage of cooperative degree programs to further their education.

## SECTION IV - LEAVE

The state does not have a centralized leave keeping system so reporting and verifying the totals listed below is difficult.

1. *Annual Leave*.
Total number of hours of annual leave taken by state employees (excludes pay-outs at separation) was 2,422,908 hours, with 48 departments reporting. Total number of hours of annual leave paid out upon separation (including retirement) was 224,244 hours, with 39 departments reporting. Total number of employees who used annual leave was 26,834 (This total was based on information provided by 39 departments). The average amount of annual leave taken per employee was 90 hours or 11 days (rounded).

In the FY 99-00 report, the average amount of annual leave taken per employee was 101 hours or 13 days (rounded).

2. *Sick Leave*.
Total number of hours of sick leave taken by state employees (excludes pay-outs at retirement) was 1,290,021 hours, based on data from 48 departments. Total number of hours of sick leave paid out to employees who retired was 87,906 hours, based on data from 27 departments. Total number of employees who used sick leave was 29,868. The average amount of sick leave taken per employee (excludes pay-outs at retirement) was 53.16 based on data from 45 departments.

3. *Funeral Leave*.
Total number of hours of funeral leave taken by state employees was 104,373 hours. Total number of employees who used funeral leave was 4,757. These figures are based on data from 45 departments. The average amount of funeral leave taken per employee was 22 hours or 3 days (rounded).

This average amount of funeral leave remains consistent with last year's report.

## LEAVE SHARING

This report was also distributed under separate cover to agency human resource administrators. Forty-three departments submitted reports and 9 did not respond. Appendix A lists information by department.

**Participation**. According to the information on file with DHR, 43 departments have leave sharing programs and 9 do not.

**Type of Program**. Ten reporting departments have leave banks, 20 have direct transfer, and 13 have programs that use both.

**Total Applications**. One hundred fifty-forty applications were submitted. A total of 17 applications were rejected and 137 were granted.

Of those granted, 106 involved the employee, 11 were for the employee's child, 8 were for the employee's parent, 12 were for a spouse. No information was provided on 14 of the cases.

**Summary of Cases**.  One hundred and sixteen cases were reported of the 154 applications granted. Occupational groups: eight EPS, 36 ASR, two PSE, two T, 29 PS, 18 LTC, six FS, 10 HCS, and five unknown or not reported.  Average years of service for the employee receiving the leave was 8.75. Average hours used was 107.

## SECTION V:  PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT

The following information was self-reported by all but three departments.

1.  Total number of employees in the state personnel system = 34,153.

2.  Total number of supervisors in the state personnel system = 5,812.

3.  Total number of non-classified supervisors = 1,543.

4.  Total number of employees who never received a performance rating = 218.  There were 5 departments whose numbers in this category were in the double digits.

5.  Total number of sanctions imposed on supervisors who failed to establish a performance plan or provide a performance rating = 0.

6.  The average completion rate is 97.54% with 35 departments reporting a 100% completion rate.

## SECTION VI: EMPLOYEE RELATIONS (Grievances, Corrective Actions, Disciplinary Actions, & Layoffs)

1.  Total reported *grievances* = 181.  This represents approximately .52% in a workforce of 34,153.

2.  Total reported *corrective actions* = 958.  This represents approximately 2.8% in a workforce of 34,153.

3.  Total reported *disciplinary actions* = 418.  This represents approximately 1.2% in a workforce of 34,153.

A.  Reasons for discipline.
  Failure to meet standards of efficient service = 207 or 26.7% (approximately .60% of the total workforce).

  Willful misconduct = 129 or 16.6% (approximately .37% of the total workforce).

  Willful failure or inability to do the job = 65 or 8.4% (approximately .19% of the total workforce).

  Final conviction of a felony = 14 or 1.8% (approximately .04% of the total workforce).

B.  Type of disciplinary action.  Total number of cases reported was 362 (no information on 56).
  Disciplinarily dismissed = 151 or 42% (approximately .44% of the total workforce).

Suspended = 54 or 15% (approximately .16% of the total workforce).

Demoted = 19 or 5% (approximately .05% of the total workforce).

Had their pay adjusted = 78 or 21.5% (approximately .22% of the total workforce).

Had other actions taken = 60 or 16.5% (approximately .17% of the total workforce).

4.  Total number of reported *layoffs* (position abolished for lack of work, lack of funds, reorganization) = 95.  Of these, 27 or 31.7% were in higher education.  The total number of layoffs represents approximately .28% of the workforce.

Actually separated from state government = 24 or 25.3% (approximately .07% of the total workforce).

Placed within own agency = 14 or 14.7% (approximately .04% of the total workforce).

Placed within another agency = 42 or 44.2% (approximately .12% of the total workforce).

Were provided separation incentives instead of layoff = 15 or 15.8% (approximately .04% of the total workforce).

| AGENCY | PROGRAM | | PROGRAM TYPE | | | Responded to 00-01 REPORT |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | On File | Bank | Transfer | Both | |
| Agriculture | YES | YES | | | X | YES |
| Corrections | YES | YES | | X | | YES |
| Education, includes School for Deaf & Blind | YES | YES | | X | | YES |
| Public Health & Environment | YES | YES | X | | | NO |
| Transportation | YES | YES | X | | | NO |
| Human Services | YES | YES | | | X | YES |
| Labor & Employment | YES | YES | | | X | YES |
| Law | YES | YES | | | X | YES |
| Auditor's Office | NO | na | | | | YES |
| Local Affairs | YES | YES | X | | | YES |
| Military Affairs | YES | YES | | X | | NO |
| Natural Resources | YES | YES | | | X | YES |
| Personnel and Administration | YES | YES | | | X | YES |
| Public Safety | YES | **NO** | | | X | YES |
| Regulatory Agencies | YES | YES | | | X | YES |
| Revenue | YES | YES | X | | | YES |
| Health Care Policy & Finance | YES | YES | | | X | YES |
| State | YES | **NO** | | X | | YES |
| Treasury | NO | na | | | | NO |
| Commission on Higher Education* | NO | na | | | | YES |
| Trustees of State Colleges | NO | na | | | | YES |
| Colorado Council on Arts | NO | na | | | | YES |
| Historical Society | YES | YES | X | | | NO |
| Student Loan Program | YES | YES | | X | | YES |
| University of CO, Boulder | YES | YES | X | | | YES |
| University of CO, Denver | YES | YES | | | X | YES |
| University of CO, Colorado Springs | YES | YES | | | X | YES |

**Appendix A: Summary of Leave Sharing Programs in Agencies**

| AGENCY | PROGRAM | | PROGRAM TYPE | | | Responded to 00-01 REPORT |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | On File | Bank | Transfer | Both | |
| University of CO, Health Sciences | YES | YES | | X | | YES |
| Colorado State University | YES | YES | | | X | YES |
| Fort Lewis College | YES | YES | X | | | YES |
| Colorado State University – Pueblo | YES | YES | | X | | YES |
| Adams State College | YES | YES | | | X | YES |
| Mesa State College | YES | YES | | X | | YES |
| Metropolitan State College of Denver | YES | YES | X | | | YES |
| Western State College | YES | YES | X | | | YES |
| Community Colleges of Colorado System | YES | YES | | X | | NO |
| Arapahoe Community College | YES | YES | | X | | YES |
| Community College of Aurora | YES | YES | | X | | NO |
| Community College of Denver | YES | YES | | X | | NO |
| Front Range Community College | YES | YES | | X | | YES |
| Lamar Community College | NO | na | | | | YES |
| Morgan Community College | NO | na | | | | YES |
| Otero Junior College | YES | YES | | X | | YES |
| Northeastern Junior College | YES | YES | | X | | YES |
| Colorado Northwestern Community College | NO | na | | | | NO |
| Pikes Peak Community College | YES | YES | | X | | YES |
| Pueblo Community College | YES | YES | | X | | YES |
| Red Rocks Community College | YES | YES | | X | | YES |
| Trinidad State Junior College | NO | na | | | | YES |
| University of Northern Colorado | YES | YES | | X | | YES |
| Colorado School of Mines | YES | YES | X | | | YES |
| Auraria Higher Education Center | YES | YES | | X | | YES |

*Includes Private Occupational School District

Total agencies = 52
    No program = 9
    Have program = 43: 10 banks, 20 direct transfer, 13 both